

SUMMARY OF REPORTS BY STATE EXTENSION SERVICES

regarding

COOPERATIVE PLAN FOR HANDLING UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT CLAIMANTS WHO ARE QUALIFIED FOR FARM WORK *

The recommended plan of action agreed upon at the Federal level on August 28, 1945, by Robert C. Goodwin, U.S.E.S., Meredith C. Wilson, Extension Service and Ewan Clague, Bureau of Employment Security placed the responsibility for initiating meetings to develop cooperative plans in each state upon the State War Manpower Director. (See copy of Federal Agreement and Recommended Plan and Meredith C. Wilson's letter of September 6, 1945, pages 4-6.)

On February 25, when it became apparent that Congress was interested in the degree to which unemployment compensation and servicemen's readjustment claimants were being placed in farm work, each State Extension Service was requested to report on this matter. (See copy of Meredith C. Wilson's letter of February 25, 1947, page 7.)

The following information is a summary of reports made by the State Extension Services in March and April 1947:

I. Type of Cooperative Agreement

1. Formally signed cooperative plans were in force in 23 states.
2. Joint and coordinated instructions regarding this matter had been issued and were in force in 6 states.
3. Cooperative arrangements were covered by contract between Extension Service and U.S.E.S. involving transfer of funds from Extension to U.S.E.S. for certain placement services in 4 states.
4. Informal agreements that local offices should work together on the basis outlined in the plan recommended from the federal level were in force in 11 states.
5. No cooperative plan was in effect in 4 states.

There seemed to be very little relationship between the formality of the cooperation and the results of the cooperative effort.

II. Cooperative Relationships

All except three of the 48 states (Kansas, Ohio and South Carolina) reported satisfactory cooperative relationships in terms of situations existing in their states. Only one state (New Mexico) reported any complaint from U.S.E.S. or Employment Security Agencies regarding the cooperation given by extension personnel. The New Mexico complaints reported were quickly investigated and the situations adjusted.

There is no evidence that unsatisfactory relationships or failure of the Extension Service to carry out its responsibilities has limited the number of claimants who have been placed in agricultural employment.

568 (5-47)

JUN 17 1947

III. Exchange of Labor Market Information

In general there has been good exchange of information between local U.S.E.S. and Extension offices. In many cases Extension has taken the initiative in supplying information regarding farm job opportunities.

Under the recommended plan and most of the agreements, the initiation of conferences regarding need for workers in agriculture rests with local U.S.E.S. offices.

There is no evidence that failure of local Extension offices to supply information in regard to farm work opportunities to U.S.E.S. offices has limited the number of claimants who have been placed in agricultural work.

IV. Referral of Claimants to Extension Offices

The number of claimants referred to Extension offices for agricultural placement varied greatly from state to state and county to county. As no special reports were required on this aspect of the program the data available is limited. However, reports from many areas were that very few or no referrals were made even though it was understood that many claimants were receiving compensation. Under the agreements the responsibility for determining whether claimants were suited to agricultural employment and for referring them to Extension rests with U.S.E.S. Extension personnel have no way of knowing how many persons suitable for agricultural employment were not referred.

V. Placement of Claimants by Extension Offices

The portion of the claimants referred to Extension office who were placed on farm work varied greatly. Major reasons for not placing some of the persons referred were:

1. Claimant refused to accept referral to a farm employer because of (a) hard work involved; (b) wage offered was "too low" (even though prevailing for the area and type of work); (c) distance to the farm was too great; (d) housing offered by the farmer was not satisfactory and (e) the claimant preferred to draw compensation rather than to do farm work, (Most frequent reason).
2. Claimants were physically or otherwise unqualified for farm work.
3. Claimants were referred during the "slack season" in agricultural employment or to offices in areas where farm job openings were limited and claimants refused referral to other areas where farm work was available.

VI. Payment of Compensation to Claimants Refusing Farm Work

In a few areas claimants who refused farm work were not granted compensation. In these areas claimants accepted farm work. In most areas claimants who refused farm work (even though wages, perquisites and other conditions were those prevailing for farm workers employed in the area) received compensation despite their refusal.

VII. Reasons that Larger Numbers of Claimants have not been Placed in Agriculture

1. Claimants were not referred to the Extension Service
2. Claimants were granted compensation even though they refused farm jobs.
3. Claimants preferred compensation to agricultural employment.
4. Claimants were not qualified for farm work.
5. Claimants did not live in areas where farm workers were needed.

On the pages which follow quotations selected from reports of State Extension Services are given to illustrate the type of working relationships involved. They are organized under the seven headings used in this summary.

Type of Cooperative Agreement.....	Pages 9 - 13
Cooperative Relationships.....	Pages 14 - 17
Exchange of Labor Market Information.....	Page 18
Referral of Claimants to Extension Offices.....	Pages 19 - 21
Placement of Claimants by Extension Office.....	Pages 22 - 26
Payment of Compensation to Claimants	
Refusing Farm Work.....	Pages 27 - 28
Reasons that Large Numbers of Claimants	
Have Not Been Placed in Agriculture.....	Pages 29 - 32

To enable the reader to locate quotations from individual states an index by states is given on pages 33 - 36.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the general principles of the theory of the structure of the atom. It is shown that the structure of the atom is determined by the laws of quantum mechanics, and that the laws of quantum mechanics are derived from the principles of relativity and quantum theory.

2. The second part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the application of the theory of the structure of the atom to the study of the properties of matter. It is shown that the theory of the structure of the atom can be used to calculate the properties of matter, and that the results of these calculations are in good agreement with experiment.

3. The third part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the application of the theory of the structure of the atom to the study of the properties of light. It is shown that the theory of the structure of the atom can be used to calculate the properties of light, and that the results of these calculations are in good agreement with experiment.

4. The fourth part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the application of the theory of the structure of the atom to the study of the properties of the nucleus. It is shown that the theory of the structure of the atom can be used to calculate the properties of the nucleus, and that the results of these calculations are in good agreement with experiment.

5. The fifth part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the application of the theory of the structure of the atom to the study of the properties of the universe. It is shown that the theory of the structure of the atom can be used to calculate the properties of the universe, and that the results of these calculations are in good agreement with experiment.

6. The sixth part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the application of the theory of the structure of the atom to the study of the properties of the future. It is shown that the theory of the structure of the atom can be used to calculate the properties of the future, and that the results of these calculations are in good agreement with experiment.

7. The seventh part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the application of the theory of the structure of the atom to the study of the properties of the past. It is shown that the theory of the structure of the atom can be used to calculate the properties of the past, and that the results of these calculations are in good agreement with experiment.

8. The eighth part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the application of the theory of the structure of the atom to the study of the properties of the present. It is shown that the theory of the structure of the atom can be used to calculate the properties of the present, and that the results of these calculations are in good agreement with experiment.

9. The ninth part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the application of the theory of the structure of the atom to the study of the properties of the future. It is shown that the theory of the structure of the atom can be used to calculate the properties of the future, and that the results of these calculations are in good agreement with experiment.

10. The tenth part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the application of the theory of the structure of the atom to the study of the properties of the past. It is shown that the theory of the structure of the atom can be used to calculate the properties of the past, and that the results of these calculations are in good agreement with experiment.

11. The eleventh part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the application of the theory of the structure of the atom to the study of the properties of the present. It is shown that the theory of the structure of the atom can be used to calculate the properties of the present, and that the results of these calculations are in good agreement with experiment.

12. The twelfth part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the application of the theory of the structure of the atom to the study of the properties of the future. It is shown that the theory of the structure of the atom can be used to calculate the properties of the future, and that the results of these calculations are in good agreement with experiment.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Extension Service
Washington 25, D. C.

Plan for Cooperative Action Involving State Employment Security Agencies,
United States Employment Service, and the Extension Service Farm
Labor Program for Handling Displaced War Workers and Veterans

THE PROBLEM

An important aspect of reconversion following the end of the war is the getting of workers who have been making war materials and the returning veterans back into useful peacetime jobs. Unemployed workers who are claimants for unemployment compensation benefits or veterans readjustment allowances are expected to be available for work as a condition for receiving payments. Displaced war workers and veterans should have an opportunity to accept, in accordance with their qualifications and past experience, both agricultural and nonagricultural jobs that may be available.

The United States Employment Service registers unemployed workers and veterans who are claimants for unemployment compensation benefits or readjustment allowances in accordance with arrangements made with State Employment Security Agencies. Placement opportunities for such workers in agriculture are not adequately known to the United States Employment Service. This is because Public Law 229, 73rd Congress, as supplemented, makes the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture and the State agricultural colleges rather than the United States Employment Service responsible for the placement of agricultural workers.

The Extension Service farm labor program is, of course, anxious to replace the unusual workers who withdraw from the labor force--aged men, women, and youth--and the imported foreign workers and the prisoners of war, all of whom have been a part of the farm work force during the war emergency, with experienced agricultural workers released from war plants and the armed services just as rapidly as such workers become available.

SOLUTION

A suitable arrangement needs to be made whereby displaced war workers and veterans with agricultural experience will be channeled from the local United States Employment Service office to the county farm labor office of the Extension Service for placement when agricultural jobs exist.

RECOMMENDED PLAN OF ACTION

Because of variations in State unemployment compensation laws, as well as differences in farm labor requirements of States, it will be desirable that the cooperative plan of action for a given State be that which seems most

practical to the State directors of the Employment Security Agency, the United States Employment Service, and the Agricultural Extension Service. It is desirable that, if satisfactory arrangements do not already exist, they be completed as soon as possible. To facilitate this, the State War Manpower Director is being requested to contact immediately the State director of extension and the State administrator of the employment security agency, and arrange for a conference of representatives of the three agencies to consider the matter.

The following operational plan is offered as a general guide.

1. The local U.S.E.S. office responsible for the registration of displaced workers and veterans will contact the county extension farm labor office or sub-office from time to time to learn of job openings for experienced agricultural workers. Displaced workers and veterans possessing suitable qualifications will then be referred by the U.S.E.S. office to the extension farm labor office for placement. Where the extension farm labor office is in need of large numbers of additional workers to fill orders for seasonal and harvest hands, that information should be relayed to the U.S.E.S. office to ascertain if unemployed nonagricultural workers might be available for farm employment.
2. In the cases of such persons referred by the U.S.E.S. office, it will be necessary for the extension farm labor office to report back on the referral card or otherwise to the U.S.E.S. office acceptance or refusal to accept a specific farm job since this information may have a direct bearing upon clearance of benefit claims.
3. In handling referrals of applicants for unemployment compensation and veterans' benefits, it is important that they receive the same consideration for job openings in agriculture as other workers with similar qualifications seeking agricultural employment.
4. Nothing in the cooperative arrangement entered into at the State level should imply a transfer of responsibility for handling unemployment compensation and veterans' allowance to the Extension Service farm labor program. Neither should there be any suggestion that the State extension service farm labor activities are in any way being supervised by the War Manpower Commission or the Employment Security Agency.

Cleared by:

/s/
Robert C. Goodwin
Director, United States
Employment Service,
War Manpower Commission

/s/
Meredith C. Wilson
Deputy Director of Extension
Farm Labor Program,
United States Department
of Agriculture

/s/
Ewan Clague
Director, Bureau of
Employment Security,
Social Security Board

August 28, 1945

1318 (9-45)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Extension Service
Washington 25, D. C.

September 6, 1945

For your information

TO ALL STATE DIRECTORS OF EXTENSION:

Subject: Plan for Cooperative Action for Handling
Displaced War Workers and Veterans

We are all interested in expediting the return to farms of displaced war workers and veterans who were experienced agricultural workers prior to the war. They are, of course, needed to fill the gap which will result from the withdrawal of foreign workers and prisoners of war, and to replace many of the older men, women and youth who have made such a large contribution to agricultural production during the war years.

Displaced war workers and veterans who may also be applicants for unemployment compensation and veterans' allowance will be registering with the U. S. Employment Service by arrangement with State employment security agencies. It is important that an arrangement be made at the State level which will insure referral to the Extension Service Farm Labor offices of registrants who, prior to the war period, were regularly engaged in agricultural occupations.

The enclosed Plan for Cooperative Action Involving State Employment Security Agencies, United States Employment Service, and the Extension Service Farm Labor Program for Handling Displaced War Workers and Veterans has been prepared here by representatives of the various Federal Government agencies involved. As you will note, it is suggested that, in those States where no suitable arrangement has been made between the Extension Service and the U. S. Employment Service for the referral to the Extension Service of displaced workers and veterans with previous farm experience, an arrangement be made as quickly as possible. Your State War Manpower Director will probably consult you at an early date regarding a conference on the matter. I am confident that whatever arrangement is worked out to meet the situation in your State will be satisfactory. The arrangement should be one of mutual advantage to the U. S. Employment Service and Extension. By it the Extension farm labor program does not acquire responsibility for the administration of unemployment compensation and veterans' allowances; neither does the War Manpower Commission acquire a supervisory relationship to the farm labor program of the Cooperative Extension Services.

It will be helpful if you will inform us of any satisfactory arrangement concerning this matter now in effect which will be continued or of any new arrangement that is agreed upon.

Very truly yours,

Meredith C. Wilson
Deputy Director of Extension
Farm Labor Program

Enclosure

(Copy to State supervisors)

1317 (9-45)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Extension Service
Washington 25, D. C.

February 25, 1947

For your immediate
attention and reply

TO STATE FARM LABOR SUPERVISORS:

Subject: Handling claimants for unemployment compensation qualified to perform agricultural work

When H. R. 2102, which would extend the present farm labor supply program beyond June 30, 1947, comes before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, there is almost certain to be a demand for information on integration of the activities of the farm labor program and of the State Unemployment Compensation Commissions with regard to applicants for unemployment compensation and veterans' adjustment payments. Such cooperation was, of course, provided for back in 1945. Please refer to my circular letter to all State Directors of Extension dated September 6, 1945, and enclosing a plan for cooperative action for handling displaced war workers and veterans approved by the appropriate representatives of the U.S.E.S. War Manpower Commission; the Bureau of Employment Security, Social Security Board; and the Farm Labor Program, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Please send me at the earliest possible date the following information for your State:

1. Outline of plan, if any, you may have worked out with the State U.S.E.S., now the State Employment Service, in line with my letter of September 6, 1945. Include a copy of any memorandum or agreement which formalized the arrangement.
2. Summarize what was done during the calendar year 1946 under the cooperative arrangement agreed upon. Give statistics on referrals from U.S.E.S., number placed in agriculture, etc.
3. Review any efforts which may have been made since September 6, 1945, to recruit and place in agriculture persons drawing unemployment compensation, or veterans' adjustment payments. Give statistics as to number of openings in agriculture, number drawing unemployment compensation payments at the time, number of agricultural workers obtained, etc.
4. Other pertinent information relating to the situation in your State which you think might be helpful in explaining the nature of the current problem and how it is being met.

Your prompt reply to this letter will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

Meredith C. Wilson
Deputy Director of Extension
Farm Labor Program

Type of Cooperative Agreement

Reports of States on Cooperative Plan Regarding Claimants for Unemployment
Compensation and Veterans Readjustment Qualified for Agriculture

State	Reply From	Date	Type of Agreement
Alabama	H. E. Williams	3/3/47	Cooperative Plan, 10/16/45
Arizona	R. R. Young	3/5/47	Cooperation at county level
Arkansas	W. M. Cooper	4/28/47	Cooperative Plan, 9/10/45
California	J. J. McElroy	3/20/47	Cooperative Plan, 10/15/45
Colorado	A. J. Hamman	3/6/47	Cooperative Plan, 10/18/45
Connecticut	P. L. Putnam	3/4/47	Cooperative Plan, 9/25/45
Delaware	G. W. Worrilow	2/26/47	Cooperative Plan--Reviewed and revised 9/2/46
Florida	H. S. McLendon	3/4/47	Cooperative Plan, 12/13/45
Georgia	R. E. Smith	3/3/47	Cooperative Plan, 11/1/45
Idaho	R. K. Pierson	3/27/47	Had contract with U.S.E.S. to 11/16/46 Informal agreement since 11/16/46
Illinois	W. D. Murphy	3/1/47	Joint instructions issued 10/19/45
Indiana	A. M. Nichter	2/28/47	Informal agreement
Iowa	H. H. Kildee	3/18/47	Cooperative Plan, 3/19/46
Kansas	Frank Blecha	4/16/47	No Plan
Kentucky	W. B. Ball	2/26/47	Contract with U.S.E.S. includes referral plan
Louisiana	W. P. Sellers	3/3&3/11/47	Close working relationship at local level
Maine	S. C. McIntire	4/9/47	Cooperative Plan, 4/16/46
Maryland	P. E. Nystrom	3/3&4/8/47	Cooperative Plan, 10/18/45
Massachusetts	R. E. Moser	2/28/47	Contract with U.S.E.S. covered
Michigan	A. B. Love	3/6/47	Close working relation at local level
Minnesota	Skuli Rutford	4/29/47	Contract with U.S.E.S.
Mississippi	R. E. Waters	4/2/47	Cooperative Plan, 10/16/45
Missouri	W. J. Murphy	3/1/47	Federal Memo issued as guide 10/5/45
Montana	H. L. Dusenberry	3/12/47	Joint instructions issued 10/2&16/45
Nebraska	L. F. Snipes	3/3/47	Joint instructions issued 10/17&24/45
Nevada	O. R. Schulz	2/28/47	Cooperative Plan, 10/15/45
N. Hampshire	N. F. Whippen	3/5/47	Cooperation at local level
New Jersey	J. C. Taylor	3/4/47	Cooperation at local level
New Mexico	Orren Beaty	3/1/47	Cooperative Plan, 12/31/45
New York	E. K. Hanks	3/3/47	Contract to 1/1/47--Cooperation on local level since 1/1/47
No. Carolina	F. S. Sloan	3/5/47	Joint instructions, 4/10/46
No. Dakota	H. W. Herbison	2/28&3/5/47	Contractual relationship
Ohio	Guy Dowdy	3/31/47	No Plan
Oklahoma	Ford Mercer	2/28/47	Cooperative Plan, 10/31/45
Oregon	J. R. Beck	2/27/47	Cooperative Plan, February 1946
Pennsylvania	D. W. Atkinson	3/6/47	Joint instructions, 8/22/46
Rhode Island	G. E. Bond	3/12/47	No Plan
So. Carolina	W. L. Brannon	4/30/47	Cooperative Plan, 10/12/45
So. Dakota	W. E. Dittmer	3/31/47	Cooperative Plan, 3/28/46
Tennessee	R. W. Moore	4/28/47	Informal arrangement
Texas	C. Hohn	2/28/47	Cooperative Plan, 4/18/46
Utah	M. H. Taylor	3/3/47	Informal arrangement
Vermont	C. B. Doane	3/13/47	Cooperative Plan, 8/7/46
Virginia	D. A. Tucker	2/28/47	Cooperative Plan, 11/16/45
Washington	W. E. Zuger	3/3/47	Cooperative Plan, 10/11/45
W. Virginia	B. F. Creech	3/10/47	No Plan
Wisconsin	Archie Mucks	3/4/47	Joint instructions, 10/16/45
Wyoming	R. E. Varner	3/1/47	Cooperative Plan, 10/8/45

PLAN FOR COOPERATIVE ACTION INVOLVING THE ALABAMA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AGENCY, THE ALABAMA EXTENSION SERVICE FARM LABOR PROGRAMS, AND THE UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE FOR HANDLING UNEMPLOYED WORKERS AND VETERANS

Experience has indicated a need for closer cooperation between the Alabama Unemployment Compensation Agency, the Alabama Extension Service and the United States Employment Service in handling unemployed workers and returning veterans who are qualified for agricultural employment.

The United States Employment Service registers unemployed workers and veterans who file claims for Unemployment Compensation or Readjustment Allowances. Such persons must be available for work as a condition for receiving benefits, and should have an opportunity to accept, in accordance with their qualifications and experience, both agricultural and nonagricultural jobs that may be available. However, placement of such workers in agricultural employment is, under provisions of law, the responsibility of the Extension Service.

The purpose of this memorandum is to set forth a cooperative plan whereby unemployed workers and veterans who are qualified for agricultural employment may be referred by the United States Employment Service to the County Agent of the Extension Service for placement. It also provides for a report by the County Agent with respect to those applicants who fail to accept suitable agricultural employment.

Operational Plan

1. The County Agent will secure complete individual job orders from farmers and furnish copies to the local United States Employment Service office serving the particular county or area.
2. Unemployed workers and veterans who possess suitable agricultural qualifications will be referred by the local United States Employment Service office to the County Agent for placement. Referral will be made by means of a referral card, Form USES-508.
3. In cases where placement results, or where the applicant is rejected by the farm employer, the County Agent will notify the local United States Employment Service office by returning Form USES-508 properly checked and signed.
4. In those instances where the worker who has been referred refuses a suitable job, the County Agent will report such refusal by completing one copy of Form Ala-Agri-1, copy of which is attached, and routing to the local United States Employment Service office which made the referral.
5. When Form Ala-Agri-1 is received in the local United States Employment Service office, the information thereon, along with such pertinent comments as the manager may make, will be recorded on Form BEN-23 and transmitted to the Alabama Unemployment Compensation Agency. The Form Ala-Agri-1 will be held in the files of the local office.

Nothing in this cooperative arrangement shall imply a transfer of responsibility for handling Unemployment Compensation and Readjustment Allowance claims to the Alabama Extension Service. Neither shall it be considered that the State Extension Service farm labor activities are in any way being supervised by the United States Employment Service or the Alabama Unemployment Compensation Agency.

/s/
P. O. Davis, Director
State Extension Ser.

/s/
Frank R. Broadway, Director
Dept. of Industrial Relations

/s/
C. F. Anderson, Acting
State Director, United
States Employment Service

Joint Instructions - Montana

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF MONTANA

EMERGENCY FARM LABOR PROGRAM

October 2, 1945

To: All County Agents

Re: Plan for cooperative action for handling displaced war workers and veterans

Dear Agents:

Arrangements have been made whereby displaced war workers and veterans, who prior to the war period were regularly engaged in agricultural occupation and who may also be applicants for unemployment compensation and veterans' allowance, may be referred by the U. S. Employment Service with whom they registered to the Extension Service Farm Labor office for agricultural employment.

The following operational plan has been adopted by the State War Manpower Commission and the Montana Extension Service in cooperation with the State Employment Security Agency for the purpose of channeling workers to agricultural employment.

1. The local USES office responsible for the registration of displaced workers and veterans will contact the county extension farm labor office or sub-office from time to time to learn of job openings for experienced agricultural workers. Displaced workers and veterans possessing suitable qualifications will then be referred by the USES office to the extension farm labor office for placement. Where the extension farm labor office is in need of large numbers of additional workers to fill orders for seasonal and harvest hands, the information should be relayed to the USES office to ascertain if unemployed nonagricultural workers might be available for farm employment.
2. In the cases of such persons referred by the USES office, it will be necessary for the extension farm labor to report back on the referral card or otherwise to the USES office the acceptance of or refusal to accept a specific farm job, since this information may have a direct bearing upon clearance of benefit claims.
3. In handling referrals of applicants for unemployment compensation and veterans' benefits, it is important that they receive the same consideration for job openings in agriculture as other workers with similar qualifications seeking agricultural employment.
4. Nothing in the cooperative arrangement entered into at the state level should imply a transfer of responsibility for handling unemployment compensation and veterans' allowances to the Extension Service farm labor program. Neither should there be any suggestions that the State Extension Service farm labor activities are in any way being supervised by the War Manpower Commission or the Employment Security Agency.

Sample copies of referral cards are enclosed. Mr. O. C. Lamport, Montana War Manpower Commissioner explains the use of this card in the following statement:

"Our offices will use this form in referring applicants to your offices. These referrals will be workers having an agricultural background and who have expressed a desire to file application for unemployment compensation. We ask that your offices upon receipt of this form, when presented by such applicants, fill in the lower left hand corner with the fact that applicant has been referred to agricultural jobs or that he has refused to accept agricultural employment or that your office has no job to offer him. This form when completed by your office should be returned to our office. The county agent is to sign where the form calls for 'employer's signature'".

Consult with your local representative of the U. S. Employment Service for further use of the referral card and operation of this plan.

It will be helpful if you will report how this arrangement will work in actual practice in your counties after some experience, and any suggestions for its improvement will be welcomed.

Very truly yours,

/s/

Geo. W. Gustafson
Assistant State Supervisor
Emergency Farm Labor Program

encls.

GWG/lc

Contractual Relationships - Massachusetts

"Our agreement with the United States Employment Service from the beginning provided for essentially the same operational plan as outlined in your letter of September 6, 1945. The services and personnel of the USES Offices were available to the Extension Offices, upon their request, and arrangements were worked out in a number of cases where the USES Offices contacted county Farm Labor Offices from time to time. In other words, both the county Farm Labor Office and the local USES Office were kept informed about the developments in either Office. Displaced workers and veterans were referred by the USES Offices to the Extension Farm Labor Office for placement. We had no special or additional agreement or memorandum formalizing this agreement other than that contained in our original agreement." (Letter of February 28, 1947, from Roy E. Moser, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Informal Agreements - Arizona

"Arizona did not work out a definite over-all State plan with the War Manpower Commission and the State Unemployment Compensation Commission for the cooperative placing of war workers and veterans in agriculture. The mechanics of placing these people who had a history of farm employment has been referred to the counties because of the varied conditions. The State Farm Labor Supervisor met with the State Director of the War Manpower Commission in October of 1945 and it was decided to bring our respective offices in each county together and help them work out a referral system applicable to their locality. Generally the workers interviewed by U.S.E.S. are referred to the Farm Labor Office if they have any farm experience. Any workers having a farming background who apply for unemployment compensation or veterans adjustment payments are referred to the County Farm Labor Offices before they are entered on the rolls to receive checks. Further contacts are made each time a person reports for the continuation of payments. Further meetings were held, with the State Farm Labor Supervisor accompanying the County Farm Labor Assistant to the employment office so as to check on the Program and to integrate the work of the two offices and to pass on any good points found in one county for use in the others. Arizona's counties are rather large and therefore unemployment compensation men hold office in certain small communities on certain days each week in order to alleviate the strain on the main office. Our county offices have been represented at these outlying sessions and have been instrumental in inducing certain workers to take job openings." (Letter of March 5, 1947, from Roy R. Young, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Informal Agreement - New York

"Since January 1, while we no longer contract with the Employment Service, the Deputy Commissioner of the State Labor Department is a member of our operating committee. This committee meets at least once a month. While the operations vary from county to county depending upon local situations, the local farm labor office and the Employment Service is cooperating as outlined in your letter of September 6, 1945". (Letter of March 3, 1947, from Elton K. Hanks, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

No Plan - Kansas

"In line with placing veterans and other persons drawing unemployment compensation, Dean Umberger offered to send the number of jobs available on Kansas farms, together with wages to be paid, each week to the officials of the unemployment

compensation division. Some way or other the cooperation between the Extension Division and those in authority in the other agencies never developed."
(Letter of April 16, 1947, from Frank Blecha, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

No Plan - Ohio

"No plan was developed between the State U.S.E.S. and the Extension Service in line with your letter of September 6, 1945. No one from this or the Director's office recalls ever having been contacted by any official from the U.S.E.S. on this matter. Neither office remembers receiving your communication of September 6, 1945. I was out of the office on sick leave from July 10 to December 1, 1945 and the communication did not come to my attention. For the above reasons no summarization or work done nor review of efforts can be made.

"I am informed by some of the county agents that the State Employment Service is referring applicants for unemployment compensation to the Extension Office where records show that they have had training in agriculture, provided such training is deemed to represent top priority in skill."
(Letter of March 31, 1947, from Guy Dowdy, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

No Plan - Rhode Island

"As I remember the situation, after receipt of your letter of September 6, 1945, we were not approached by the State USES Director concerning the problem. Director Stuart and I have conferred with the State USES Director at various times and have discussed this along with other problems."
(Letter of March 12, 1947, from G. E. Bond, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

No Plan - West Virginia

"We never have entered into any written agreement in West Virginia with the State Employment Service. During the war we worked closely with the office and they referred a good many applications to our county offices."
(Letter of March 10, 1947, from Benjamin F. Creech, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

COOPERATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

California

"The policies and plans have proven satisfactory. Local offices of both agencies have been mutually helpful and cooperative."

(Letter of March 20, 1947, from John J. McElroy, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Delaware

"During March and April 1946, with the permission of USES officials, a farm labor assistant was present at Middletown, Smyrna, Milford and Seaford on those days when workers appeared to collect their weekly compensation checks. The labor assistant had a list of job vacancies on farms in the area covered by the employment office. Workers claiming compensation were interviewed by the employment service manager. Those with farm experience were referred to the farm labor assistant for further interview. Workers were questioned about past experience. Practically all men had a previous farm background. All men physically qualified, whether experienced or not, were offered farm employment."

(Letter of February 26, 1947, from G. M. Worrilow, Associate Director)

Indiana

"Very good working relationships have existed between the State offices of U.S.E.S. and Extension Service, and likewise in most counties where U.S.E.S. personnel were located."

(Letter of February 28, 1947, from A. M. Nichter, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Louisiana

"A representative of Emergency Farm Labor Office from this State was present at all of these Itinerant Points of Service for the purpose of cooperating with representatives from the U.S.E.S. in encouraging and placing labor on farms."

(Letter of March 3, 1947, from W. P. Sellers, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Maine

"I can summarize our relationship with the Employment Service with the statement that we have found that organization most cooperative."

(Letter of April 9, 1947, from Smith C. McIntire, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Maryland

"On March 13, 1946, in company with our Dean of Agriculture and our associates in the Farm Labor Program, we conferred with the State Director of the USES and his associates as has been our annual practice to discuss mutual plans for meeting the coming harvest and food processing season. At that conference we developed plans for a joint meeting of our State Farm Labor Committee, the Unemployment Compensation Board for Maryland and the State officials of the USES to work out the most effective type of program for utilizing in agriculture, claimants for Unemployment Compensation. That meeting was held in Baltimore on March 28. (1946)

"The results were very constructive both as to a better mutual understanding of problems involved and a joint plan of action. It was agreed to hold two con-

ferences of County Agents, USES Managers and Unemployment Compensation Deputies conducted jointly by the State representatives of all three organizations. Those meetings were held at Baltimore and Easton on April 17 and 18 (1946) respectively.

"On February 18, 1947, we conferred again with the State USES Director and his associates with the view to developing a cooperative plan of action for 1947. Two conferences of county representatives are planned similar to those of last year.

"We feel that we have done everything possible to promote good relationships with the USES and to develop a cooperative plan of action. Our relationships with the State USES are of the highest order and we work closely together."
(Letter of March 3, 1947, from P. E. Nystrom, Deputy Director in Charge, Farm Labor)

Michigan

"We have not had a definite outline of plan with the State U.S.E.S. that was in general use. In agreement with them verbally we had fairly good working relationships with the county agricultural agents and the local employment officers and thus we could handle the matter inasmuch as they were all a part of the local veterans council."
(Letter of March 6, 1947, from A. B. Love, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Minnesota

"On April 1, 1946, and again on March 31, 1947, letters were sent to all county agricultural agents, making specific reference to the problems of unemployment compensation and urging the closest cooperation with the Employment Service in this matter. We have been assured by the Employment Service that almost without exception the kind of cooperation we suggest has been the rule in the counties."
(Letter of April 29, 1947, from Skuli Rutford, Assistant Director)

Nevada

"In the general supervision of our Labor Program in the state, we have observed that personnel of local Farm Labor Placement offices and the Employment Service offices were cooperating very closely in exchange of information and workers. Since we have received no complaints from the Unemployment Compensation Division or the Employment Service, we believe that this phase of the program is operating very satisfactorily as outlined in the agreement."
(Letter of February 28, 1947, from Otto R. Schulz, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

New Jersey

"Our County Agents and Labor Assistants have contacted local offices for agricultural labor when needed and have received satisfactory cooperation from such offices."
(Letter of March 4, 1947, from J. C. Taylor, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

New Mexico

"After this Manual of Operations and Agreement was mailed to the different counties in the state, criticism was received from time to time from the USES and the Employment Security Commission that county agents were not cooperating

in placing agricultural workers. Each time a complaint was received a check was made with the counties mentioned in the complaint. Each time it was found that the USES, and not the county Extension Agent, had not complied with the agreement. On the first complaint it was found that the USES was not providing applicants with referral cards and the county agents had no way of knowing if they were sent by the USES or not.

Investigating another complaint that the Extension Service was not cooperating with the USES in placing farm labor, it was found that the USES was not living up to the agreement but were referring a large number of people for agricultural work who were not classified as agricultural workers. When they reported to the county agent's office for work they stated definitely that they had no farm experience and did not want farm work."

(Letter of March 1, 1947, from Orren Beaty, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

North Carolina

"The co-operation and understanding between the two agencies has been very good throughout the entire period."

(Letter of March 5, 1947, from F. S. Sloan, State Program Leader)

Oklahoma

"This plan and agreement has been in effect since October 1945 and it has worked to the entire satisfaction of the United States Employment Service and Extension Service so far as we are able to determine."

(Letter of February 28, 1947, from Ford Mercer, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Oregon

"On two occasions during 1946, the writer conferred with Mr. S. Gaiser, Administrator of the State Unemployment Compensation Commission, as to the success of our cooperation in this undertaking. I also asked Mr. Gaiser if they had found any of our offices delinquent in discharging the obligation accepted by this procedure. On both points Mr. Gaiser replied that 'they had found our cooperation satisfactory and that our staff was discharging our obligation to the limit of job openings available consistent with the qualifications of the applicant.'"

"I would say that so far as I know we have met the requested cooperation of the Oregon Commission to the fullest possible degree; furthermore, so far as I know they have made no complaint as to either the spirit nor the effectiveness of that cooperation."

(Letter of February 27, 1947, from J. R. Beck, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

South Dakota

"Several meetings were held with the State USES and Extension Representatives to work out a practical operating plan. Area meetings of county agents and area USES directors were held at which time the program was presented and discussed by the State Extension Supervisor, the State USES Director and then discussed by the group. The Area USES offices were reluctant to cooperate in all instances as they felt they did not have any responsibility for the farm labor program."

(Letter of March 31, 1947, from W. E. Dittmer, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Utah

"In each of our major labor using counties informal arrangements have been made with representatives of these same agencies to have all available agriculture workers referred to the Extension Service Farm Labor offices for placement. This procedure worked very effectively in 1946.

"Our Extension Farm Labor personnel were given access to unemployment records including veterans unemployment security payments. In several instances the Extension Service personnel and members of Farm Labor Boards in various counties visited these veterans and other unemployed people in an attempt to encourage them to accept agricultural employment.

"The Extension Service personnel in Utah feel that this informal cooperative relationship was satisfactory and that there were only isolated instances of people drawing unemployment compensation who were fitted for agricultural employment except during slack seasons when there was relatively little demand for agricultural labor."

(Letter of March 3, 1947, from Morris H. Taylor, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Wisconsin

"All during the war this system of referring agricultural workers to county agent offices was satisfactory as far as we know, and we know of no reason why it shouldn't continue to work at this time. The agreement is still in force and if it doesn't work we have never been so notified or have never received any complaints whatsoever from the Employment Service or the Wisconsin Industrial Commission."

Comment from Langlade county monthly report:

"Thirty-two of the 48 World War II veterans which we have placed on farm jobs in field work for the Canning Co., were referred to this office by the representatives of the W.I.C. and the USES, also, four non-veterans were referred to us for farm employment and accepted jobs. This fine cooperation has been of great assistance, and we believe a work of praise should be in order. We also know that our combined appeal and efforts during the past month has resulted in many more ex-servicemen seeking their own jobs to aid our farmers."

(Letter of March 4, 1947, from Arlie Mucks, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

EXCHANGE OF LABOR MARKET INFORMATION

Connecticut

"On the first of each month our Farm Labor Assistants furnish to each State Employment Service Office a list of job openings in agriculture."

(Letter of March 4, 1947, from P. L. Putnam, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Idaho

"We have been operating on an informal arrangement with the Social Security Board which includes the weekly listing of agricultural openings for use in job testing of UC and SRA applicants."

(Letter of February 27, 1947, From R. K. Pierson, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Kentucky

"In our period of greatest demand for farm workers we have kept local Employment Service offices informed of the farm jobs available. The itinerant Employment Service interviewer has been contacted regularly by the local county agents office in regard to the needs for farm workers and applications on hand."

(Letter of February 26, 1947, from W. B. Ball, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Missouri

"As a result of our action this office received approximately 400 copies of current applications that had been placed on file with U.S.E.S."

(Letter of March 1, 1947, from William J. Murphy, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

South Dakota

"So many of the county agents felt that they were not getting results from the USES that they discontinued putting direct orders to the area USES offices. However, the State Farm Labor Office did keep the area USES offices informed with detailed, itemized reports."

(Letter of March 31, 1947, from W. E. Dittmer, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Tennessee

"We have found employees of the State Employment Service ready to work with us in any emergency we have had in farm labor and in keeping us informed as to the labor market as they see it each month."

(Letter of April 28, 1947, from R. W. Moore, Asst. Director In Charge, County Agent Work)

Wyoming

"We forwarded to the U.S.E.S. each week sufficient copies of our weekly labor report so each of their offices throughout the state would be provided with current information in regard to agricultural jobs unfilled."

"In addition to the weekly reports, close contacts were maintained between the county agents and U.S.E.S. offices in each locality where both offices are located and periodical contacts were made in all others during the routine check-ups by the USES representatives."

(Letter of March 1, 1947, from R. E. Varner, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

REFERRAL OF CLAIMANTS TO EXTENSION OFFICES

Arkansas

"During the cotton picking season last year, and particularly in 1945, courthouses were swamped with workers visiting the Employment Security resident offices applying for and receiving checks, when cotton was rotting in the fields."
(Letter of April 28, 1947, from Walter M. Cooper, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Connecticut

"The cooperation that we received from the local offices of the State Employment Service varies considerably. A few of the offices have referred to us a number of prospective agricultural workers for employment; some have not referred any. The total number has been small because there has been a shortage of workers who are willing to do manual labor. Although we have had a number of people on unemployment compensation in Connecticut, there has always been a shortage of workers in the Connecticut State Employment Service for the types of jobs that compete with agriculture."
(Letter of March 4, 1947, from P. L. Putnam, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Florida

"The managers of the Florida State Employment offices and the county agricultural agents in Ft. Pierce and Vero Beach have reported the liquidation of long lines of recipients of unemployment compensation by the State Employment Service. The workers had a farm background and were placed on farm jobs by cooperation between the two agencies."
(Letter of March 3, 1947, from H. S. McLendon, Asst. State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Georgia

"Out of 134 county offices reporting at the end of the year only two counties reported assistance received from the USES office.

"An excerpt from a letter written by a Georgia county agent summarizes the overall situation much better than I can give it. 'It seems that something has got to be done with the method of handling labor through USES. There has been times when we had lots of fellows registered with USES for work, fellows that never did anything but farm until the war came along, they were graded up and given their unemployment pay because they could not find a job for them--I asked for 300 in 1946, when they had that many and more on their rolls, they advised me, but not classified as farm labor. This unemployment pay caused us not to harvest lots of peanuts. This year they advised me they could get lots of help for us, but never did bring back a one of the some 200 asked for'."
(Letter of March 3, 1947, from R. E. Smith, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Illinois

"During the period November 1945 through December 1946, 1,736 referrals were received from the Employment Service, and of this number 322 were placed on farm jobs."
(Letter of March 1, 1947, from W. D. Murphy, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Iowa

"No state-wide figures are available on the number of referrals of veterans or returned war workers that were made by the U.S.E.S. offices to the extension offices. An estimate would be about 300 for 1945 and about 1,000 for 1946."
(Letter of March 18, 1947, from H. H. Kildee, Director)

Kansas

"There were no referrals from the U.S.E.S. except at Wichita, Girard, and Kansas City, Kansas. These referrals amounted to about 425 men."
(Letter of April 16, 1947, from Frank Blecha, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Maryland

"In July 1946, fifteen county agents reported that they had filed 345 orders for 774 workers. Pursuant to those orders 179 men had been referred by the USES, 103 men reported of whom 40 were placed in farm jobs."
(Letter of March 3, 1947, from P. E. Nystrom, Deputy Director, In Charge, Farm Labor)

Mississippi

"A large number of County Agents report no referrals were made to County Agent's office by U.S.E.S. representatives, or the workers who were referred, did not report."
(Letter of April 2, 1947, from R. E. Waters, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Nebraska

"We followed the Federal plan. The number referred from the United States Employment Service to our county agents was small. We are still trying to follow this out, but are receiving very few referrals."
(Letter of March 3, 1947, from L. F. Snipes, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

New Hampshire

According to information I have just received from each County in the State, they report: 163 referrals for year-round help in 1946 and 410 referrals for seasonal help. Eighty-nine of the year-round referrals and 110 of the seasonal referrals were used in agricultural employment."
(Letter of March 5, 1947, from Norman F. Whippen, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Pennsylvania

"On August 16th, 1946, the State Supervisor again visited Potter County and went with the County Agent and the Farm Labor Assistant for an interview with Mr. Dietrich, manager of the Coudersport office of the Employment Service. He reported that 294 persons (including 163 veterans) were then drawing compensation in Potter County. Although potato growers would need nearly three times as many persons to pick potatoes, we did not that day get a promise to help. Good results followed later, however, and referrals were made by the Employment Service."

Comment from Delaware county report:

"The U.S.E.S., during two weeks, sent us one man. We then decided to try a classified ad in the Chester Times and twenty men were placed immediately on Thursday. The following morning, fifty men were waiting in the corridor, and we received fifty-five telephone calls. On Saturday morning, twenty more men applied. We put a sign on the door, 'No More Apple Pickers Needed.'"
(Letter of March 6, 1947, from D. W. Atkinson, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

South Carolina

"During the rush season of employment on farms in 1946 something near 36,000 unemployed people were reported by USES in their general reports, but only 1,228 of this number were ever referred to county agents or farm labor assistants for placement.
(Letter of April 30, 1947, from W. L. Brannon, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

South Dakota

"In July 1946 when U.S.E.S. reported 3,001 persons drawing compensation and Extension had openings for 8,099 workers, U.S.E.S. referred 146 claimants to Extension."
(Letter of March 31, 1947, from W. E. Dittmer, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Tennessee

"We have had several hundred referred to us from the State Employment Service but only a small percentage have gone on the farm to work."
(Letter of April-28, 1947, from R.W. Moore, Asst. Director In Charge, County Agent Work)

Washington

"Chelan-Douglas County reports, 'We received eight referrals with introduction form in 1946.'
"Yakima County reports, 'No referrals were made to this office by U.S.E.S. on Introduction Form 6463.'
"Walla Walla County reports, 'There were five referrals from the U.S.E.S. to us for the year.'
(Letter of March 3, 1947, from Walter E. Zuger, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Wisconsin

"As of March 2, 1946, there were 22,630 people who applied for unemployment compensation, and 32,655 veterans who applied for Veterans' Readjustment Allowances. During the period from November 1, 1945 to about March 1, 1946, there were 427 farm workers referred to the county offices. Eighteen counties did not have any referrals from U.S.E.S."
(Letter of March 4, 1947, from Arlie Mucks, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Wyoming

"No statistics are available covering referrals from the U.S.E.S. offices to the county agent's offices in Wyoming counties, however, we have been advised by the county agents that the U.S.E.S. offices refer all agricultural applicants to them for placement, and we feel that the intent and purpose of the agreement has been followed."
(Letter of March 1, 1947, from R. E. Varner, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

PLACEMENT OF CLAIMANTS BY EXTENSION OFFICES

Arizona

"There has been a monthly average of about one hundred thirteen referrals by unemployment compensation commission and U.S.E.S. to Farm Labor Offices with about thirty of these being placed."

(Letter of March 5, 1947, from Roy R. Young, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Arkansas

"Many of the claimants for unemployment compensation were former farm workers and it was not necessary that they go to the county agents' offices to be referred to farm jobs, since they knew on whose farm they would prefer to work if they wanted to accept agricultural employment. Therefore, only in a few places did these workers come to the county agents' offices."

(Letter of April 28, 1947, from Walter M. Cooper, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Colorado

"Workers that were being laid off by industry generally would not accept farm wages. Several persons that were referred to the Extension Service agreed to wages and working conditions offered by farmers and then turned the job down because they didn't like the house or because it was too far from town, etc."

"We had considerable experience with veterans on adjustment payments, particularly among Spanish Americans. They were offered several kinds of farm work but principally beet thinning and hoeing. They usually told our recruiters that anyone would be a fool to work for \$10.00 per week. That being what they considered they could make over \$20.00 that they were getting by not working."

(Letter of March 6, 1947, from A. J. Hamman, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Delaware

"The majority of those interviewed refused farm work, giving as their reasons a preference for other types of work, lack of transportation, small pay, a promise of other employment, or no reason other than dislike of farm work."

(Letter of February 26, 1947, from G. M. Worrilow, Associate Director)

Illinois

"Farm advisers report that they have been disappointed with the program since a vast majority of the workers referred to them under this procedure do not want jobs. It becomes disgusting to them to have men agree to accept jobs and then learn that they never appeared for work. It is estimated that less than half of the men for whom referral cards are received by mail ever report to the farm labor offices. During the months of June and July 1946, when seasonal workers were so badly needed for pea harvest and the small grain and hay harvest, more than 1,000 referrals were received but less than 100 were willing to accept farm jobs."

(Letter of March 1, 1947, from W. D. Murphy, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Indiana

"In many cases the applicants refused agricultural employment on the grounds that the wages were not much, if any, above the amount of the unemployment compensation payments. Furthermore, the number of applicants with farm experience referred to Extension Service were greatest in areas of the state where we have an overpopulated

agriculture. In these areas the farm wages and the farm job opportunities were usually far below those in the better agricultural areas, and the applicants were unwilling to take farm employment in other parts of the state."
(Letter of February 26, 1947, from A. M. Nichter, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Kentucky

"Many workers referred to our offices have not been willing to accept the type of farm jobs available."
(Letter of February 26, 1947, from W. B. Ball, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Maryland

"Most of those qualified only for farm jobs were not located in areas of farm job opportunities. Most of these referred to farm jobs had various excuses for not wanting such work or were not qualified. By law, no one could be compelled to move to new areas of employment.

"We made another intensive effort in September at apple harvest time to make use of claimants for Unemployment Compensation. The orchardists of Western Maryland were in need of 500 harvest workers. Our Farm Labor Assistant in Washington County worked with the USES men in Garrett County and personally interviewed 250 men who were reporting each week for benefits. The job offer was attractive-- free room and board, free transportation, 10¢ per bushel base pay and 2¢ per bushel bonus for those who remained throughout the season. For hourly work 60¢ per hour net was offered. The USES manager advised them that he would restore them to the benefit rolls after they returned. Local labor was averaging \$10.00 per day picking apples. Not a man responded. We had to meet the situation in other ways."

(Letter of March 3, 1947, from P. E. Nystrom, Deputy Director In Charge, Farm Labor)

"Eighteen persons were referred by USES Office for farm work; eleven actually applied for farm work. Not one of the referrals accepted a farm job."
(Letter of July 15, 1946, from J. Walter Eby, County Agricultural Agent)

"Two applicants came to my office inquiring about farm jobs. One was a returned veteran about twenty-four years of age. He was advised to come back to my office two days later at a specified time and informed a prospective employer would be there to talk to him. The prospective employer showed up but I haven't seen the applicant.

"The second applicant was an old man seventy-three years of age who lived near Henderson. I found out from his neighbors that the old man not only did not want a job but he could live very comfortable without work."
(Letter of July 13, 1946, from F. M. Rogers, County Agent)

"Practically all persons directed to us by U.S.E.S. were men who industry did not use or men who were of a shifty type who never work very long anywhere. Most of these men were the type that would work for a week or so and be gone or else never go to the job at all."

(Letter of July 13, 1946, from L. C. Burns, Carroll County Agricultural Agent)

Minnesota

"Except during a short period in the winter time, we have been able to make placements of about all who have listed themselves as farm workers and who have been willing to take farm jobs."
(Letter of April 29, 1947, from Skuli Rutford, Assistant Director)

Mississippi

"We have a county report which shows the following: '23 referrals to County Agent's office; 3 left referral cards and have not been back to County Agent's office; 14 not interested in farm work at present prices; 3 physically unable to do farm work; 1 never reported to County Agent's office; 1 interested as Assistant Plantation Manager, no request on file for such; 1 gone to another state.

"The following is a report from another county: One wanted to drive a caterpillar tractor; county agent's office had no request. One was already on the farm. One already had a farm job with his uncle and was going to stay. Twenty-five were not interested and refused farm referrals. Three were referred to farmers." (Letter of April 2, 1947, from R. E. Waters, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

New Jersey

"In the spring of 1946 the Camden county farm labor committee desired the release of students from school for the harvest of early fresh market vegetables. It was pointed out by the Extension Service and the Employment Service representatives that there was an available supply of local labor in the city. The Employment Service representative stated that they had approximately 200 applicants on file for day work. The following day the County Agent and the Employment Service representative went over the list and, as a result, workers were obtained from the Employment Service files, and there was no necessity for the release of school children."

(Letter of March 4, 1947, from J. C. Taylor, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

New Mexico

"In one county the county agent requested 150 farm laborers, the USES sent over around 50 applicants to fill this request. When they arrived at the county agent's office, only a small percentage of them were farm workers and took farm jobs. The rest refused to take jobs because they were not classified as farm workers."

(Letter of March 1, 1947, from Orren Beaty, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

New Hampshire

"The type of worker referred by the Employment Service is, in most cases, of a lower grade. One Farm Labor Assistant told me over the telephone this morning that in his opinion the workers referred to him could not be placed elsewhere, and for this reason farmers are not interested in obtaining help through this source."

(Letter of March 5, 1947, from Norman F. Whippen, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

New York

"Under contract with Extension, U.S.E.S. was mailing placements of farm workers in 1946. During the week of August 27 to September 1, 1946, the following results were obtained in seventeen U.S.E.S. offices where industrial workers who applied for jobs were asked to accept agricultural work: There were 10,555 agricultural jobs on file. There were 12,393 job applicants of whom 60 or 70 percent had file for unemployment insurance. One hundred and seven accepted farm work." (Data from memorandum of September 10, 1946, by R. A. Polson, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

North Dakota

"I have the following from the State Director's office of our North Dakota State Employment Service: Workers referred (who were UC or SRA claimants) to agricultural work for calendar year 1946 were 4,467."

(Letter of March 5, 1947, from H. W. Herbison, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Ohio

"I am also informed that approximately 90 percent of such referrals are individuals who could not be placed on farms because of many reasons, some of which are (1) lack of proper housing; (2) physical incapacibilities; (3) moral integrity; (4) lack of dependability; etc."

(Letter of March 31, 1947, from Guy Dowdy, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Pennsylvania

Comment from Blair county report of September 17, 1946:

"The U.S.E.S. sent us names of thirty veterans who were to report at our office for apple picking. Nine came, but three refused to pick fruit."

(Letter of March 6, 1947, from D. W. Atkinson, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Rhode Island

"In a few cases, satisfactory workers have been referred in this way. The majority of referrals, however, have been men who were mentally or physically handicapped. Most of these were actually unemployable. Of course, we have no way of knowing what information workers may have entered on their registration cards. It may be, as one USES man said, 'The only farm experience these men have had was on the home farm. It was hard work, they didn't enjoy it and they refused to admit farm experience on their registration card.' Undoubtedly, an extremely small, perhaps even negligible, percentage of Rhode Island workers accepting unemployment compensation payments have had any farm experience."

(Letter of March 12, 1947, from G. E. Bond, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

South Carolina

"There were sufficient openings available to place all workers referred by USES if the workers would have accepted farm jobs."

(Letter of April 30, 1947, from W. L. Brannon, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

South Dakota

"Of the 493 referrals made in 1946 by U.S.E.S. offices to Extension offices, 422 were placed by Extension in farm work."

(Letter of March 31, 1947, from W. E. Dittmer, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Vermont

"Referrals were handled as stipulated in the agreement. From August 7, 1946, to March 1, 1947, the total number of referrals was 395 of which 79 were placed in agricultural work. The others presumably did not find the farm job which was suited to them."

(Letter of March 13, 1947, from C. B. Doane, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Washington

"Clark County reports: 'As most of the applicants were crippled and mentally deficient, it was difficult to screen out many persons who could be placed in year-round work. Many seasonal workers were selected from persons sent to us by the U.S.E.S'."

"Thurston County reports: 'The type of labor they send us as a rule is very poor. I have the feeling they send them just to get rid of them, as the time they sent a man dead drunk to our office'."

"Pacific County reports: 'In general, those referred to us turned out to be good farm hands'."

(Letter of March 3, 1947, from W. E. Zuger, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Wisconsin

Many of those referred were old or physically unfit or were men with large families for whom adequate housing was not available on farms. In addition it was very evident that agriculture was up against the same difficulty as industries in the placement of veterans, namely that so many of them were not ready to accept employment.

Comment from Barron county report:

"Have been making contacts with veterans referred to us by USES who are on unemployment compensation, with agricultural background--able to work but seldom found willing."

Comment from Door county monthly report:

"Mr. Larson was to give me a list of all unemployed of Door county so I could go out to contact and recruit from that list enough workers to replace the PWs. I was to have the list January 15, but at this writing (February 6, 1946) I have not received it. So its PWs we are using. I think that the USES realizes that it is dependable workers we need, and I am sure that the USES also realizes that the unemployed insured are not dependable. Therefore, no list."

Comment from Sauk county report:

"I contacted USES at the City Hall when they were paying unemployment insurance--asked them to send over farm help--One man was sent over to date. This man was 64 years old, blind in one eye, in very poor health and totally unfit for farm work of any kind."

Comment from Vernon county report:

"We had quite a number of men referred to us by the USES and in the past week or two we had quite a number of these fellows that have come in with the intention of going out on farms and so far have had no difficulty finding places for them. The demand for help on farms continued without much change. We have had quite a number of veterans referred to our office by the USES and have placed a few of these men. We do find that most of these men are not too much interested in taking these farm jobs as long as they can continue to draw unemployment compensation."

(Letter of March 4, 1947, from Arlie Mucks, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION TO CLAIMANTS REFUSING FARM WORK

Alabama

"Local offices of the U.S.E.S. cooperated wholeheartedly during the peanut harvest season of 1946, and several hundred workers were obtained from their referrals. In a number of cases, veterans and displaced war workers were removed from the unemployment compensation rolls because of their failure to accept farm employment to which they were referred."

(Letter of March 3, 1947, from H. Earle Williams, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Arkansas

"Many claimants, since leaving agriculture, had become skilled classified workers. For example, he was a sharecropper and picked cotton in 1942; while in 1946, he was a plumber, carpenter, brick layer, etc., and cotton picking was not a comparable job. Therefore, he went ahead in a lot of instances drawing compensation."

(Letter of April 28, 1947, from W. M. Cooper, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Colorado

"Our people in the counties soon became disgusted with the whole matter because the Department of Unemployment Security would generally refuse to take a recipient of compensation off the rolls if he objected in any way to the job that was offered."

(Letter of March 6, 1947, from A. J. Hamman, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Delaware

"Over 600 individuals were interviewed during the peak week. Total actual farm placements over the entire two-month period numbered less than 12. Many of the applicants apparently met UCC regulations and were not deprived of unemployment compensation for refusing farm work."

(Letter of February 26, 1947, from G. M. Worrilow, Associate Director --Attachment, "Summary of Extension, USES and UCC Cooperative Activities in the Field of Farm Labor Placement")

Illinois

"Reports received from the counties indicate that workers rarely are denied unemployment compensation because they refuse to accept jobs offered to them."

(Letter of March 1, 1947, from W. D. Murphy, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Massachusetts

"During the course of the year and as the harvest season progressed, more and more workers were needed. Many people were on unemployment compensation and on veterans adjustment and were not interested in farm work. The Extension Service requested the help of the USES in recruiting harvest hands and inquired if some way could be developed whereby able-bodied men on unemployment compensation may not be forced out to work. A number of USES supervisors circularized the men on their unemployment compensation lists and told them about the farm jobs available and the wages that would be paid. They bluntly told these men when they came back for their next week's compensation that these agricultural jobs were open and that they would have to withdraw their unemployment compensation from

them. As a result of this a large number of able-bodied men, including veterans, became available for harvesting."

(Letter of February 28, 1947, from Roy L. Moser, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

New Mexico

"In the Manual of Operations it states that 'Workers having agricultural experience prior to the war may refuse referral to agricultural work because of the low wage rate. County agents are responsible for determining whether the wages offered by an agricultural employer are standard for the area. In the event a worker refuses referral on these grounds, the usual claims procedure will be followed and the county agent's statement will be used as evidence in adjudging the claim.' As far as we have ever been able to learn, no one was ever dropped from the rolls for receiving unemployment compensation or drawing veteran's adjustment payments for refusing to accept agricultural work at the prevailing wage scale."

(Letter of March 1, 1947, from Orren Beaty, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

South Carolina

"In one county two colored workers were placed on a dairy farm where they worked two weeks. During that time they were notified by the USES that they were eligible for unemployment compensation for which they had applied. These workers immediately quit their job on the dairy farm and remained idle for the duration of their reception of unemployment compensation. This, I admit, is an extreme case, but it is indicative of the attitude of certain USES officials."

(Letter of April 30, 1947, from W. L. Brannon, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Wisconsin

Comment from Vernon county monthly report:

"In the majority of cases, the boys coming back are gradually getting back to work but as long as this unemployment deal is in effect, there is going to be that certain group that are not going back to work until they have to."

(Letter of March 4, 1947, from Arlie Mucks, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

REASONS THAT LARGER NUMBERS OF CLAIMANTS HAVE NOT BEEN PLACED
IN AGRICULTURE

Alabama

"On a whole, workers who accept agricultural employment on account of referrals by the U.S.E.S. are not satisfactory and will be used by farmers only in case of emergencies and as a last resort. Veterans and displaced war workers drawing unemployment compensation do so from choice, and they resent our efforts to find farm employment for them. The majority of veterans and displaced war workers who are interested in farm work have no difficulty in making their own contacts and prefer to do so."

(Letter of March 3, 1947, from H. Earle Williams, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Arizona

"Generally there is a tendency on the part of people collecting unemployment compensation or veterans adjustment payments not to return to agricultural pursuits until such time as their full allotment of payments has run out. This does not apply to certain farm jobs such as mechanics, tractor drivers, dairy workers, etc., but it is very noticeable in cotton picking. There is also a tendency on the part of workers not to shift back from industry to agriculture unless forced to do so by economic pressure."

(Letter of March 5, 1947, from Roy R. Young, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Arkansas

"If workers do not want to work, they don't, has been our observation. Many of them, on the other hand, drew some compensation and went ahead doing odd farm jobs unbeknowns to the Employment Security Division."

(Letter of April 28, 1947, from Walter M. Cooper, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Connecticut

"I believe the reason that we do not get any referrals from some offices and very few from others is not due to cooperation, but due to the fact that there are no men available."

(Letter of March 4, 1947, from P. L. Putnam, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Idaho

"I might add that the matter of referring compensation claimants to agricultural openings has been greatly exaggerated problem in this state. Actually, it is of little significance since agricultural workers are not covered and the claimants are principally seasonally unemployed industrial workers. There might be a point in the case of SRA claimants which now make up about half of our unemployed. However, for the winter months the number of openings in agriculture have been so few that no problem has existed."

(Letter of February 27, 1947, from R. K. Pierson, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Illinois

"As long as the regulations now in force continue, I doubt that the Extension Service or any other agency can be successful in getting workers who receive unemployment compensation to accept farm or other jobs unless those jobs pay considerably more than the unemployment compensation benefits and provide contributions for future compensation."

(Letter of March 1, 1947, from W. D. Murphy, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Iowa

"Many placements were made in agriculture through this, the cooperative plan. But the intent of the plan did not always function. That seemed to be due to several factors including:

1. A system of job classification of labor which placed many ex-agricultural workers in a wartime developed classification for which no employment was possible in their home town, county or state. Failing to get employment under this classification made them eligible for compensation.
2. The eligibility requirements--Under Servicemen's Readjustment Act--Title V (Exhibit Q) states that work must be suitable. Most of the men referred to Farm Labor offices were city and town men who did not wish to work on farms--could not get to the farms and back--wished to live at home--did not know farm work; and therefore refused farm jobs or did not appear at the Farm Labor Offices for possible placement.
3. The reports of the County Extension Director (County Agent) Form IESC-243-A (Exhibit F) were not forwarded to the Iowa Employment Security Commission.
4. A general reluctance to force veterans to accept work, at least during the early months of their return from service.
5. Local U.S.E.S. offices were kept busy from one week to the next processing claims and had little time to question or investigate the validity of the claims."

(Letter of March 18, 1947, from H. H. Kildee, Director)

Maine

"Many of these people recognize the conflict between the payment of compensation and the need for importing help to produce food. However, it can safely be said that the worker, Unemployment Compensation Commission, U.S.E.S. and Extension all appreciate the problem. Some want to do something about it but haven't been able to. Others don't desire to correct it. The public has thus far supported the demand of the latter group or haven't objected to them. I believe it can be added that those who now demand a quick solution oversimplifying the problem. The idea that unemployed will or can be forced from the compensation lists and into food production represents wishful thinking."

(Letter of April 9, 1947, from Smith C. McIntire, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Maryland

"The program of getting people off Unemployment Compensation rolls into agriculture just does not click. Such people have not demonstrated that they will do farm work and farmers are skeptical about them. Laws governing procedures involved need revising. Statewide in Maryland there are now 41,000 manufacturing workers on Unemployment Compensation rolls and 30,000 non-manufacturing workers. Most are located in Baltimore City. The jobs are out in the State. They apparently cannot be compelled to go where they will be needed at harvest time."

(Letter of March 3, 1947, from P. E. Nystrom, Deputy Director In Charge, Farm Labor)

Mississippi

"The results of the survey also indicates many of the workers who left the farm for industrial activities and armed forces do not want to return to the farm at the prevailing agricultural wages, when they can draw \$20.00 per week from Unemployment Compensation."

(Letter of April 2, 1947, from R. E. Waters, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Missouri

"The actual fact of the matter is that most of the persons with whom U.S.E.S. have dealt are just not interested in farm jobs and those few who have been interested in farm jobs have usually not been the type of help that farmers felt that they could hire profitably. Apparently in most cases where there has been lack of cooperation within the county, it has been because both the extension workers and the U.S.E.S. personnel have felt that they were not accomplishing results and were not justified in spending their time on something that they were not accomplishing results in."

(Letter of March 1, 1947, from William J. Murphy, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Montana

"The difficulty we have encountered has been due to the fact that in many cases the applicant does not really want to take a job and would prefer to draw compensation. In this case he may take the referral card and disappear for some time and then return stating that there are no jobs available in agriculture. Or he may go to the county agent's office and refuse all of the jobs offered regardless of how well he may be adapted for the job."

"In other words, the thing that I am trying to say is that it is extremely difficult to make a placement of the applicant who has his mind made up in advance that he prefers unemployment compensation to work. There are always plenty of excuses as to why he cannot take a job. The point that I think is important in this respect is that in most cases there has been plenty of work for people in agriculture in this state if they really had the desire to go to work."

(Letter of March 12, 1947, from H. L. Dusenberry, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Oklahoma

"Reports from the field and in our conversations with the county agents and Farm Labor Assistants, the number of displaced war plant workers and returned veterans who have taken farm jobs has been relatively small. The main reason for refusal of farm employment has been a dislike for long hours and hard manual labor."

(Letter of February 28, 1947, from Ford Mercer, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

South Carolina

"It appears in this state that compensation has been paid workers on too lenient a basis, but the greater problem as far as agricultural work is concerned is relatively low wage and the hard work involved in doing many of the farm jobs. This situation to a great extent will be changed as more equipment becomes available and farms become more mechanized. Until such time as this takes place workers are going to be reluctant to accept farm jobs."

(Letter of April 30, 1947, from W. L. Brannon, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

South Dakota

"It was not the fault of the USES that more returning veterans or displaced war workers did not go into agricultural work through efforts of the USES, as those potential workers were more concerned in unemployment compensation provided through the veterans' administration or the state."
(Letter of March 31, 1947, from W. E. Dittmer, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Texas

"County agents stated that in practically no case had an agricultural worker who was an ex-G.I. ever accepted an agricultural job that was offered to him. Under ordinary conditions the most that he would get for general farm or dairy work was from \$12.00 to \$25.00 a week. He would turn the job down with the understanding that he was not qualified for that kind of work and the county agent would send the card back to the employment service.

"The writer was in Val Verde County, which is a Latin-American Section, and there were over 300 men mostly Latin-Americans who were receiving their unemployment compensation. Although the ranchers needed workers, they could not induce the fellow to go to work because the wages they paid were not as high as the unemployment compensation. From all accounts workers were encouraged to take the workman's compensation."

(Letter of February 28, 1947, from C. Hohn, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Virginia

The accomplishments resulting from this plan have not been too great. Mr. Frank A. Cavedo, Director, U.S.E.S. recently informed me that by and large county agents are not referring workers to their offices. Neither is the U.S.E.S. personnel generally furnishing county agents with a list of agricultural workers."
(Letter of February 28, 1947, from D. A. Tucker, State Farm Labor Supervisor)

Index of Quotations from States

<u>State</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
Alabama	Formally signed cooperative plan.....	9
	Good results as claimants were removed from compensation rolls if farm employment was refused.....	27
	Claimants drawing compensation resent efforts to place them on farm jobs.....	29
Arizona	Cooperation through informal agreement.....	12
	Monthly average of 30 placements from 113 referrals made by U.S.E.S.....	22
	Claimants usually do not return to agriculture until payments run out.....	29
Arkansas	Cotton rots while claimants draw compensation.....	19
	Workers willing to accept farm employment didn't need to come to Extension office.....	22
	Claimants draw compensation because of "higher" skill.....	27
	Claimants don't work unless they want to work.....	29
California	Cooperative relationships--satisfactory.....	14
Colorado	Claimants unwilling to accept farm work.....	22
	Claimants given compensation if they objected to farm jobs offered.....	27
Connecticut	Information furnished C.E.S. offices each month.....	18
	Few referrals received from C. E. S.....	19
	No men available.....	29
Delaware	Cooperative relationships--Methods Used.....	14
	Majority of claimants refuse farm work.....	22
	Claimants not deprived of compensation for refusing farm work.....	27
Florida	Claimants referred to Extension and placed on farm jobs.....	19
Georgia	Claimants not referred to Extension-- peanuts lost.....	19
Idaho	Agricultural openings listed weekly with S.S.B. for job testing.....	18
	Problem exaggerated.....	29
Illinois	1,736 referrals from E.S. to Extension in 14 months - 322 were placed on farm jobs.....	19
	Workers referred do not want jobs.....	22
	Claimants rarely denied compensation because of refusal of farm work.....	27
	No agency can get claimants to accept farm work under present regulations.....	29

<u>State</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
Indiana	Cooperative relationships satisfactory.....	14
	Applicants refuse farm employment.....	22
Iowa	Estimate 1,000 referrals from U.S.E.S. to Extension in 1946.....	20
	Reasons why cooperative plan works poorly.....	30
Kansas	No cooperative plan.....	12
	Referrals from only 3 offices.....	20
Kentucky	E. S. offices kept informed regarding farm jobs available.....	18
	Workers referred refuse farm jobs.....	23
Louisiana	Cooperative relationships--methods used.....	14
Maine	Cooperative relationships satisfactory.....	14
	Claimants can't be forced off compensation into farm jobs.....	30
Maryland	Cooperative relationships - satisfactory - meetings with State and county personnel.....	14
	103 of 179 men referred by U.S.E.S. in July 1946 reported to 15 Extension offices.....	20
	Few workers placed--details from counties.....	23
	Plan cannot be successful under present regulations.....	30
Massachusetts	Cooperative relationship covered by contractual agreement.....	12
	Claimants took farm jobs because compensa- tion would be discontinued if they refused.....	27
Michigan	Cooperative relationships - fairly good - both agencies on local veterans council.....	15
Minnesota	Cooperative relationships - satisfactory.....	15
	Have placed almost all willing to take farm jobs.....	23
Mississippi	Many counties report no referrals from U.S.E.S.....	20
	Few workers placed--details from counties.....	24
	Claimants do not want farm work at prevailing wages.....	31
Missouri	Farm job applications filed with U.S.E.S.....	18
	Claimants not interested in farm jobs.....	31
Montana	Joint instructions regarding cooperative relationships.....	10-11
	Reasons why plan has worked poorly.....	31

<u>State</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
Nebraska	Very few referrals from U.S.E.S.....	20
Nevada	Cooperative relationships - satisfactory No complaints from U.S.E.S. or U.C.D.....	15
New Hampshire	U.S.E.S. referred 573 persons in 1946 - 199 were placed..... Most workers referred not satisfactory.....	20 24
New Jersey	Cooperative relationships--satisfactory..... Claimants take care of need for farm workers in Camden county.....	15 24
New Mexico	Complaints from U.S.E.S. and E.S.C. investigated promptly..... Most applicants refuse farm jobs..... Workers refusing farm work not dropped from compensation rolls.....	15 24 28
New York	Cooperation through informal agreement..... U.S.E.S. handling farm placement under contract with Extension got 107 of 12,393 applicants to accept farm jobs.....	12 24
North Carolina	Cooperative relationships--satisfactory.....	16
North Dakota	4,467 claimants referred to farm jobs in 1946.....	25
Ohio	No cooperative plan..... 90 percent of referrals could not be placed in farm jobs.....	13 25
Oklahoma	Cooperative relationships--satisfactory..... Claimants dislike long hours and hard manual labor.....	16 31
Oregon	Cooperative relationships--satisfactory--O.U.C.C. Administrator says Extension discharging its obligations under plan.....	16
Pennsylvania	Good results from referrals by U.S.E.S. in Potter county. One referral in two weeks in Delaware county where classified ad got results..... Only 9 of 30 referred by U.S.E.S. report to Blair county extension office.....	20 25
Rhode Island	No cooperative plan..... Most workers referred by U.S.E.S. are unemployable.....	13 25

<u>State</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
South Carolina	U.S.E.S. referred 1,228 of 36,0000 unemployed to Extension.....	21
	Could place all who would accept farm jobs.....	25
	Claimants quit farm jobs to accept compensation.....	28
	Claimants don't like low wages and hard work.....	31
South Dakota	Cooperative relationships --generally satis- factory--methods used--some U.S.E.S. offices reluctant to cooperate.....	16
	State Farm Labor offices keep area U.S.E.S. offices informed of farm jobs.....	18
	U.S.E.S. referred 146 claimants in July 1946 when 3,001 were drawing compensation and Extension had openings for 8,099.....	21
	Placed 422 of 493 workers referred.....	25
	U.S.E.S. not at fault because plan works poorly.....	32
Tennessee	Monthly labor market information furnished by T. E. S.....	18
	Several hundred referred, but few accept farm work.....	21
Texas	Workers prefer compensation to farm work because of low wages.....	32
Utah	Cooperative relationships--satisfactory-- methods used.....	17
Vermont	Of 395 workers referred 79 were placed on farm jobs.....	25
Virginia	Cooperative plan working poorly.....	32
Washington	Three counties report eight, none and five referrals from U.S.E.S. in 1946.....	21
	Two counties report most claimants referred as unsatisfactory, one that they were good farm hands.....	26
West Virginia	No cooperative plan.....	13
Wisconsin	Cooperative relationships--satisfactory--no com- plaints from E.S. or W.I.C. Method and results in Langlade county.....	17
	U.S.E.S. referred 427 to Extension in four months at a time when they had 55,285 claimants.....	21
	Few claimants placed--county details.....	26
	Some claimants won't accept jobs if they can draw compensation.....	28
Wyoming	Farm labor report to U.S.E.S. each week.....	18
	All agricultural applicants referred by U.S.E.S. to Extension.....	21